DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 964 SO 022 867

AUTHOR Vandell, Kathy; Dempsey, Scott B.
TITLE Creating a Gender-Fair Multicultural Curriculum.
INSTITUTION American Association of Univ. Women, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 92
NOTE 8p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of University Women, 1111 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Awareness; Cultural Education; *Cultural Pluralism; *Curriculum Design; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Problems; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; *Multicultural Education; Multicultural Textbooks; *Sex Fairness
IDENTIFIERS National Standards

ABSTRACT

The creation of a gender-fair multicultural curriculum is the necessary basis for the equitable schooling of all girls and boys in the United States. The key to success in curriculum reform is the inclusion of everyone with a stake in the schools in an effective, productive process. Defining the term multicultural education illustrates the different meanings that have evolved. The national curriculum policy debate over the standards-setting and assessment-design processes focuses on five controversial issues: (1) the measurement of performance; (2) the use of national standards; (3) the effect of national standards on local control of education; (4) the knowledge included in national standards; and (5) the development of a national core curriculum through national standards and assessment. In order to achieve a gender-fair multicultural curriculum, the changes must address national policy, state and local curriculum designs, textbook and materials adoption, classroom practices, and assessment systems. To ensure successful multicultural curriculum reform, diversity of participants at all levels of the process is important. A curriculum description provides eight ingredients for the ideal gender-fair multicultural curriculum; four strategies to develop a curriculum reform process that effectively brings everyone involved in the schools together; and five pitfalls that can damage the process. Contains 21 references. (CK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 371 964

Creating a Gender-Fair Multicultural Curriculum

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CAROL L. BURNETT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 022 807

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN

Creating a Gender-Fair Multicultural Curriculum

June 1992

GENDER EQUITY: AN ELUSIVE GOAL

As a democratic, pluralistic society, America draws its strength from educating all its citizens to achieve their full potential. It is therefore imperative that the formal curriculum, which conveys the central messages of education, provides students with "mirrors" reflecting their own experiences as well as "windows" revealing those of others. But for most students, particularly girls and minorities, "the present curriculum provides many windows and few mirrors."[1]

The pervasiveness of inequity in the curriculum was one of the major conclusions of *The AAUW Report: How Schools Shortchange Girls*, released in February 1992 (see the "Resources" box on page 4). The report assessed how schooling has changed for girls since 1972, when the federal government passed Title IX of the Education Amendments, prohibiting sex discrimination in education. The report concluded that after 20 years of research and reform efforts aimed at ensuring gender equity, more has been said than done to improve schooling for girls. Despite the many gains women have made in the past quarter-century, gender equity in education, including the curriculum, remains an elusive goal.

The AAUW Report was part of the *AAUW Initiative for Educational Equity*, which was launched in 1991 to bring gender equity to the center of the ongoing debate over national education reform. In January 1991, AAUW released the results of its national poll on girls and self-esteem, "Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America," and hosted a roundtable of leaders from government, education, and industry to discuss its implications. In February 1992, the AAUW Educational Foundation released *The AAUW Report* and hosted the National Education Summit on Girls, which brought together leaders of 30 preeminent national organizations dedicated to teaching, training, testing, and girls' development. These leaders made commitments to take steps toward achieving gender equity in education. AAUW members, through state and local roundtables and projects, are carrying the *Initiative* into schools around the nation.

National Education Association/Joe Di Dio

An equitable multicultural curriculum would convey the common culture we share while respecting the complexities of American cultural pluralism.

To support these efforts, AAUW has produced a series of issue briefs addressing gender equity and educational restructuring, classroom practices, and teacher training. (see the "Resources" box on page 4).

In this brief, we turn to the complex question of creating a gender-fair multicultural curriculum, the necessary basis for equitable schooling for ***all*** American girls and boys. Such a curriculum would offer both "windows" and "mirrors" to students of both sexes from all of America's cultures.

Finding the balance between America's shared culture and its many overlapping "microcultures" has never been easy. Those who follow local school policy know that curriculum reform always is potentially controversial. The key to success is including everyone with a stake in the schools in an effective, productive process.

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: DEFINING TERMS

Because the United States is a pluralistic society, our culture is a complex web of overlapping cultures. National origin creates one strand of the web; race and ethnicity create another strand; class or socioeconomic status creates another; occupational and religious affiliations create yet another; and so on. All Americans both share elements of a broad, national culture and belong to other cultural groups that constitute American society. Indeed, this marvelous "weaving ... of many threads of all sizes and colors" is the defining characteristic of American culture."[2]

By exploring the many varieties of American experience, an equitable multi-

cultural curriculum would convey the common culture we share while respecting the complexities of American cultural pluralism.

The term "multicultural education" is used here in its broadest and most frequently used sense, to encompass both curriculum (what is taught) and classroom practice (how it is taught). Multicultural education requires:

- transforming the whole curriculum to provide students with knowledge about the entire range of cultures that constitute American society;
- examining the experiences of each cultural group from its own perspective;
- including the contributions of women;
- incorporating teaching practices that adapt to girls'—as well as boys'—individual strengths (gender-fairness);
- providing diverse learning environments that can be adapted to the learning styles of female and male students from many cultures, thus enabling them to achieve their full potential;
- helping students develop the ability to communicate and function effectively with diverse groups and within multiple cultures—requisite skills for success in today's America.[5]

Though this definition of multicultural education is now generally accepted by education scholars and policymakers, it is still relatively new. It has evolved—and continues to evolve—from the efforts of historically underrepresented groups to obtain equal opportunity for all children. There is still much debate over how multicultural education is defined, and scholars within this movement disagree about the meaning of various terms used in the debate.

One piece of this debate that has been much in the news is the call by some African American scholars for an Afrocentric curriculum. Although some proponents define it—and most people generally perceive it—as a curriculum focusing entirely on African American cultures, this definition is rejected by many other African American scholars and educators. These scholars use the term "Afrocentric curriculum" to denote the practice of describing, within a larger multicultural curriculum, the African American experience from that culture's perspective. Similarly, some proposals for Afrocentric curricula involve establishing separate Afrocentric schools for African American children, while others call for creating Afrocentric courses within traditional schools.

As this example illustrates, the evolving nature of the theory of multicultural education means that scholars may use the term in different ways. Two especially common uses of the term "multicultural education," both of which reflect earlier stages of the theory, are *not* currently accepted:

- Teaching *us* about *others*: Special, isolated classes, textbook sections, or lessons focused on explaining the culture or experiences of particular cultural groups from the perspective of the "mainstream," or dominant, culture. In this approach, the curriculum focuses on the experiences of those cultural groups that have succeeded in using the institutions of education and mass media to define theirs as "the" American culture. To promote cultural harmony, units on "other" cultures are "added on" to this traditional curriculum. Typically, however, these units portray the "other" cultures as subordinate, peripheral, or problematic to the "mainstream" culture.

In the United States, curricula are determined at the state and local levels. But most American public schools follow a highly uniform curriculum that has been shaped by tradition.

- Teaching *others* to be like *us*: Special, isolated, or pull-out courses intended to assimilate members of "other" cultural groups into the dominant culture. This approach assumes that the goal of education is to instill the culture of those groups that define themselves as "mainstream" into all members of society. These courses are seen as temporary measures: bridges between the child's original culture and the mainstream culture.

A curriculum that focuses exclusively on the experiences and perspectives of a single cultural group is ethnocentric—the exact opposite of a multicultural curriculum. Many countries with ethnically homogeneous populations have a standardized national ethnocentric curriculum that is taught in all schools. The United States has no national curriculum; curricula are determined at the state and local levels. But in practice most American public schools follow a highly uniform curriculum that has been shaped by tradition. This traditional curriculum is essentially Eurocentric; that is, it emphasizes the perspectives, history, and products of certain groups of European Americans. In addition, it still centers on the perspectives and accomplishments of men, largely ignoring women of all races and ethnicities.

NATIONAL CURRICULUM POLICY

The 1990s is emerging as a pivotal decade for education reform. There is widespread consensus among the President, Congress, the governors, and education policymakers that changes must be made in the education system. These changes will inevitably affect school curricula.

The current drives for changes in curriculum policy began with the publication of *A Nation At Risk* (1983), the first of many reports asserting that our schools were at the root of America's declining international economic position. Many education critics contend that the declining achievement of American students is due to both the quality (how students are taught) and the content (the curriculum) of American schooling.[6]

This concern about the quality and content of the curriculum is reflected in the six National Education Goals announced in February 1990 by the National Governors Association and President Bush. Goal 3 calls for "demonstrated competency" in five core disciplines: English, mathematics, science, history, and geography. Goal 4 further calls for American students to be "first in the world in two of those subjects, math and science, by the year 2000."[7] To attain these goals, the National Education Goals Panel called for the creation of both national standards in the core disciplines and an assessment system to determine whether we are meeting those standards. The National Commission on Education Standards and Testing (NCEST) was set up to accomplish these tasks.[8] By defining what students should learn and conducting national evaluations to ascertain whether they have done so, these programs will inevitably have an enormous impact on the curriculum. Therefore, if adopted, it is imperative that the content standards and assessment systems be gender-fair and multicultural.

The debate over the standards-setting and assessment-design processes has coalesced around five issues:

How Do We Measure Performance? Many education experts have criticized the proposals for a national system of tests and evaluation systems designed to measure student achievement. These critics strongly oppose using a single standardized test as the assessment instrument. (This option has already been ruled out by NCEST.) Most models now being proposed combine standardized tests with performance-based assessments such as portfolios and projects. For example, students might present portfolios of their best work to boards of judges, or present demonstrations of work (particularly in the performance arts).

But critics of these proposals fear that, even if states are allowed to choose from a variety of standardized tests and required to include performance-based assessments, policymakers and parents may still focus solely on test scores. These results might be misused—much as standardized test scores are currently misused—to compare schools.

Further, critics doubt that any national assessment system can be either culture- or gender-fair.

Thus far little effort has been made to ensure that the panels developing the standards represent our nation's diversity, but many advocates for educational equity, including AAUW, are working to change this.

To be equitable, tests must be carefully balanced for gender and culture differences. The types of projects and performances permitted must include activities and intellectual approaches that reflect the practices and experiences of all cultures and both genders.

For example, research shows that girls tend to prefer learning tasks that are

connected and holistic, while boys tend to prefer a more separated, analytical approach. A girl might be more likely to choose to study nursing home life by interviewing a resident and writing a biography, while a boy might be more likely to do a statistical analysis of the demographic characteristics of the residents. A gender-fair assessment system would not only test both skills—quantitative analysis and narrative analysis—but also would balance the test between them.

A national assessment system must draw on the strengths of both genders and all cultures by testing competency in *all* skills required by our society.

Are National Standards the Right Tool? Some education experts don't believe that performance on national assessments—particularly standardized tests—correlates highly with national economic performance. They claim that no assessment system can adequately measure the knowledge and skills that lead to economic success. They also fear that a system of standards and assessments will simply create a generation of students who, while they test well, can't think or work well. But proponents of standards and assessments believe that under this system American students would be required to learn more, resulting in a better-qualified labor force.

Will National Standards Undermine Local Control of Education? Educators and concerned citizens worry that establishing national standards will interfere with a cherished American tradition: local control of education. NCEST attempted to answer these critics by rejecting the concept of a single national test in favor of allowing states to select from a range of tests. NCEST also pointed out that local schools would be free to design any curriculum that met the national standards.[7]

What Knowledge Should Standards Include? Content standards are being developed by national organizations of teachers and scholars, such as the national associations for teachers of math and English, in each of the core content areas (see the "Resources" box on page 4). Critics point out that the list of "core" disciplines in the National Goals omits important subjects like civics, social studies, arts education, and foreign language. They also argue that developing standards independently in subject-based organizations leads to a lack of coordination across the curriculum.[8]

Do National Standards and Assessment Create a National Core Curriculum? Some educators suggest that all U.S. schools should teach a core curriculum. One of the best-known spokespersons for this position is E.D. Hirsch, whose Core Knowledge Foundation has developed a detailed and specific curriculum designed to compose half the elementary curriculum for grades one through six.[9]

Although there is widespread agreement that America's strong tradition of local control of education makes it politically unfeasible to mandate such a curriculum at the federal level, some analysts fear that the national standards, no matter how broadly drawn, will create a de facto national curriculum.

© Ramon Dekeuis/The Miami Herald

A complex web of overlapping cultures: *Celebrating graduation from a Miami preschool*

Research shows that girls tend to prefer learning tasks that are connected and holistic, while boys tend to prefer a more separated, analytical approach.

Few dispute that Americans share a common cultural heritage that should be taught in our schools. The trouble arises over what should be included in that shared body of knowledge. Although there is no reason in theory that a core curriculum could not be a gender-fair multicultural curriculum, most proponents of this proposal want to preserve the traditional curriculum.

THE "NEW SCHOLARSHIP"

These controversies reflect an ongoing debate in academe. Historically, the academy has performed two functions in society: transmitting existing knowledge across generations and producing new knowledge. In the last quarter-century, academics have produced "an astonishing body of new knowledge about how cultures treat those groups and individuals who are branded as *not* belonging to the dominant society."[10] Some scholars term this research the "new scholarship."

The current debates concern the incorporation of this new body of knowledge—for instance, what the new scholarship has revealed about the everyday life of working-class women in American history—into the curricula of colleges and schools. In higher education, the debate takes the form of conflict over extending tenure to, and accusations of political bias against, the academics producing this research. In elementary and secondary education, it takes the form of resistance to adopting a multicultural curriculum that would reflect this research.

Three arguments typically are made against including the new scholarship in the curriculum:

- It is less rigorous and of lower quality than traditional scholarship.
- Including multicultural scholarship in the curriculum diminishes the story of our common heritage and distorts the historical record.
- Focusing on diversity fosters cultural and political disunity.

Scholarly Excellence. Critics of the new scholarship like to pluck out isolated examples of poorly done research and hold them up to ridicule. In any enterprise as large and varied as the American academy, examples of poor work by scholars of every persuasion are bound to emerge. But the vast bulk of the new scholarship is widely acknowledged to be of very high quality, having weathered the profession's

RESOURCES

AAUW PUBLICATIONS

To order the resources in this column, contact the AAUW Sales Office at 800/225-9998, ext. 219. A delivery charge will be added to each order. Prices are subject to change.

The AAUW Report: How Schools Shortchange Girls (1992). A groundbreaking examination of how girls are disadvantaged in America's schools (grades K-12). Although often unintentional, gender bias in education can put girls at a disadvantage to boys, derailing their dreams and limiting their futures. AS13 [$14.95 members/$16.95 nonmembers]

The AAUW Report Executive Summary (1992). Overview of *The AAUW Report* research, plus recommendations for educators and policymakers. AS14 [$6.95 members/$8.95 nonmembers]

The AAUW Report Action Guide (1992). Concrete strategies for combating gender bias in our schools, based on *The AAUW Report* recommendations. AS15 [$6.95 members/$8.95 nonmembers]

Executive Summary: Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America (1991). Highly readable summary of AAUW's 1990 national poll on girls and self-esteem. ASG01 [$5.00]

A Call to Action: Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America (1991). Synopsis of the AAUW poll and January 1991 national roundtable attended by leaders in government, industry, and education—with action ideas for community change. AS12 [$12.95 members/$14.95 nonmembers]

Video: *Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America* (1991). A dramatic look at the inequities girls face in America's schools. AS10 [VHS Format/15 minutes/$19.95 members/$24.95 nonmembers]

AAUW Issue Briefs relating to education [$1.00 each]:

- "Creating a Gender-Fair Multicultural Curriculum" (D3)
- "Equitable Treatment of Girls and Boys in the Classroom" (C1)
- "Restructuring Education: Getting Girls Into America's Goals" (D6)
- "Stalled Agenda: Gender Equity and the Training of Educators" (B19)
- "Vocational Education: Equity in the Making?" (C9)
- "College Admissions Tests: Opportunities or Roadblocks?" (B17)
- "Women and Tenure: The Opportunity of a Century" (D2)

CURRICULUM REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (GENERAL)

The American Tapestry: Infusing Multiculturalism in Education. Send $7.00 to the National Association of State Boards of Education, Attention: Publications Department, 1012 Cameron Street, Alexandria, VA 22314; 703/684-4000.

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development produces a variety of materials on curriculum issues. For a catalog, contact ASCD, 1250 North Pitt Street, Alexandria, VA 22314-9719; 703/549-9110.

One Nation, Many Peoples: A Declaration of Cultural Interdependence (1991). Contact the New York State Education Department (address: Albany, New York 12234) for a limited number of free copies of this report and, later, for the state's final curriculum outline.

History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1988). Send $6.00 to the California Department of Education, Bureau of Publications, Sales Unit, P.O. Box 271, Sacramento, CA 95812-0271; 916/445-1260.

CURRICULUM DOCUMENTS BY DISCIPLINE

National Science Teachers Association, *Essential Changes in Secondary Science* (1990). Free copies available from NSTA, 1742 Connecticut Ave., Washington, DC 20009; 202/328-5800, ext. 39 or 61.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, *Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for Math* (1989). Send $25.00 to NCTM, 1906 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091; 703/620-9840.

National Council of Teachers of English, *Democracy Through Language* (1989). Send $8.95 plus $1.50 shipping and handling to NCTE, Attention: Book Orders, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, IL 61801; 217/328-3870.

Charting a Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century (1989). Send $7.00 plus $2.50 shipping and handling to the National Council for the Social Studies, 3501 Newark Street N.W., Washington, DC 20016; or call the warehouse at 800/683-0812.

quality controls in refereed journals, conference presentations, academic publishing, and tenure and promotion processes.[1]

Curriculum Distortion. Some critics of the new scholarship maintain that the traditional Eurocentric scholarship and curriculum represent the "objective truth" about our society, and that this "truth" has been corrupted by the efforts of minorities and women to forge a more inclusive curriculum. But a curriculum that incorporates the perspectives and history of all the cultural groups that have shaped American society presents a more—not less—accurate picture of American history and life.

Unity and Diversity. Some critics of the new scholarship contend that the traditional curriculum's emphasis on the western European roots of American institutions serves two functions: it promotes cultural unity and empowers all children by immersing them in the mainstream culture that dominates our social and political system. Emphasizing our differences, they contend, will only exacerbate cultural isolation and social tensions.

But presenting students with an uncritical, mythic image of a monocultural society does not necessarily create unity. As children grow older, they discover that the realities of American history and society belie this myth. Their disillusionment may lead to far more cultural isolation and alienation than would have been the case if the complexities of American cultural pluralism had been explored.

WHERE TO FOCUS

To achieve a gender-fair multicultural curriculum, five elements of curriculum policy must be addressed:

National Policy. The process of debating and establishing national standards for education must not be allowed to degenerate into stamping the federal seal of approval on the traditional curriculum. Fortunately, the prominence of the public debate and the participation of a wide range of diverse organizations makes this outcome unlikely. The imposition of national standards must be accompanied by national, state, and local action to provide adequate resources to the schools. After all, they have to implement the changes needed to meet the standards.

State and Local Curriculum Designs. Most states and many local districts have standards and outlines for the school curricula in their jurisdictions. It is imperative that these documents model gender-fair multicultural education. These documents are typically reviewed and revised periodically, with substantial opportunity for public input. Procedures vary by state, but typically a curriculum document is produced by a state-level committee appointed by the governor, superintendent of education, or board of education. This document is then widely reviewed by education experts and public comment is solicited. Finally, it is submitted to the appropriate policymaking body for action.

Textbook and Materials Adoption. The textbooks and materials adopted by state and local school districts probably do

The Ideal Curriculum

Ingredients and Strategies

INGREDIENTS

The ideal gender-fair multicultural curriculum:

- **INCORPORATES** the best of the "new scholarship" on gender, race, ethnicity, and class. This scholarship is particularly prominent in history, social studies, and literature.
- **PROVIDES** every student with knowledge of the wide range of American cultures as well as competence in using the tools of our shared culture and the ability to critique this culture from multiple perspectives.
- **ENCOMPASSES AND AFFIRMS** all of our past, denying none of it.
- **USES** textbooks and materials that present multiple perspectives, showing women and all cultural groups—not just elites—as active participants, producers, and doers in their families, occupations, communities, cultures, and societies.
- **DRAWS** on the multicultural resources of the local community.
- **COORDINATES** content, attitudes, and skills across the curriculum and across grade levels.
- **PROMOTES** use of a wide range of teaching practices designed to play to the strengths of all learning styles. (The new scholarship on learning styles will be especially helpful in science, math, and the communication arts.)
- **LINKS** the curriculum to a gender- and culture-balanced assessment system that provides opportunities for both performance reviews and testing. The questions and tasks used in these reviews and tests would include a diversity of settings and cultural backgrounds.

STRATEGIES

These strategies can help develop a curriculum reform process that will effectively bring together everyone involved in the schools:

- **BRING** many voices into the debate. Do this by ensuring diverse representation on committees of experts and by encouraging public comment from a range of diverse groups.
- **COMBINE** top-level clout with grassroots involvement.
- **INSIST** that curriculum review/design committees include teachers. To ensure coherence and coordination, make sure that there are representatives from all grade levels and disciplines.
- **FOCUS** on expanding the traditional curriculum to be more inclusive instead of attacking it.

PITFALLS

These dynamics can damage the process:

- **MISLEADING LABELING.** Some curriculum proposals "talk the talk" but fail to "walk the walk": they are portrayed as being multicultural, but the content isn't there.
- **DUELING ETHNOCENTRIC CURRICULA.** Trading one ethnocentric curriculum for another one is self-defeating.
- **THE TRUTH MONOPOLY.** Defenders of the traditional curriculum tend to present it as "objective truth" that will be distorted by including the findings of the new scholarship. But the real question is: What does the best scholarship—both old and new—tell us about our society? The answers belong in the curriculum.
- **POLARIZING RHETORIC.** Don't allow the debate to be framed as a winner-take-all, either/or choice between mutually exclusive absolutes. Look for a "win-win" solution that each participant can support.
- **TEACHER BASHING.** Don't join those who blame teachers for every deficiency in student performance.

more to shape the curriculum than the curriculum outline itself. Some states adopt the textbooks used statewide, while in other states textbook adoption takes place at the local level. In many jurisdictions, particularly in statewide-adoption states, there is a public review process similar to that used for the curriculum outline.

Classroom Practices. Using gender-fair multicultural education *techniques* is just as important as providing the right standards and materials. Ultimately this requires changing the way educators are trained—both in professional schools and in professional development opportunities after they have begun their careers. One possible strategy is to require—through administrative rules or legislation—all teachers to take some training in multicultural education. (For a detailed discussion of this issue, see the AAUW issue brief *Stalled Agenda: Gender Equity and the Training of Educators.*)

Assessment Systems. The systems for measuring student achievement, whether through standardized tests or other performance measures, must also be gender-fair and culturally sensitive. Because of the complexity of measurement and evaluation designs, assessment systems are typically designed and adopted by education experts with little or no consultation with the public. But specialists in gender-fair multicultural education can provide information and insights that can assist decisionmakers with this process.

ALL ABOARD: THE MASTER STRATEGY

The key to successful multicultural curriculum reform is to ensure that many voices are heard at all levels of the process: in the panels of experts, committees of citizens, and public hearings involved in the procedures described above. Here are some strategies that work:

American life and culture is much more diverse, complex, and rich than the traditional curriculum teaches us.

- **Lobby those who make appointments to panels and committees to include a diversity of voices on those committees.** In Florida, state officeholders making appointments to the Multicultural Education Review Task Force were given specific demographic requirements to fulfill with those appointments. For instance, they had to appoint at least one teacher and one northern Florida resident.
- **Recruit and encourage a range of diverse organizations and individuals to participate in public hearings and other opportunities for review and comment.** Emphasize the advantages of joining the process rather than attacking it. In California, for instance, observers on both sides of the issue believe that the public comment on the first draft of the latest version of the state curriculum standards in history and social science resulted in a significant increase in the new curriculum's multicultural content.
- **Educate the public.** In New York, opponents of multicultural education portrayed it as an abandonment of the traditional curriculum rather than as a transformation of that curriculum designed to reflect the realities of our pluralistic society. It's easier—and more effective—to define your own terms up front than to correct misunderstandings later.

With its long history of education activism and its commitment to mediating diverse points of view to find common ground, AAUW is ideally equipped to play a leading role in these efforts. AAUW branches, working in coalition with other community organizations, can take the following actions:

- Review the curriculum and textbooks in the local school district.
- Analyze proposed curricula for gender-equity and multicultural components.
- Provide local policymakers with copies of this brief and other information on gender-fair multicultural education.

(For more ideas, see the "Resources" box on page 4.)

FINDING THE BALANCE

In a pluralistic society, this question must be addressed: what is the appropriate balance in the curriculum between emphasizing our commonality and our differences? We can agree that all children need to learn about the elements of common culture that bind us together as a nation. This enables everyone not only to participate in our national life but also to analyze and critique it. Yet women and members of "other" cultures also deserve the empowerment that comes from studying one's own culture and learning in one's own style. Further, the cultural group that has traditionally shaped the curriculum in its own image no longer constitutes—if indeed it ever did—the majority of the population.

American life and culture is much more diverse, complex, and rich than the traditional curriculum teaches us. The schools of the future need gender-fair multicultural curricula that prepare coming generations to live and work in our pluralistic society.

FOOTNOTES

1. Emily Style, "Curriculum As Window and Mirror," in *Listening for All Voices: Gender Balancing the School Curriculum* (Summit, NJ: Oak Knoll School, 1988).

2. Randolph Bourne, "Trans-National America," *Atlantic Monthly* 118 (July 1916), p. 98.

3. Christine E. Sleeter and Carl A. Grant, "An Analysis of Multicultural Education in the United States," *Harvard Education Review* 57 (1987), pp. 421-444; Patrick Lee and Nancy B. Gropper, "Sex-Role Culture and Educational Practice," *Harvard Educational Review* 44 (1974), pp. 369-407; Bob H. Suzuki, "Curriculum Transformation for Multicultural Education," *Education and Urban Society* 16 (1984), pp. 294-322.

4. Anne Lewis, "Getting Unstuck: Curriculum As a Tool of Reform," *Phi Delta Kappan* (March 1990), pp. 534-538; Ronald Rothman, "What to Teach: Reform Turns Finally to the Essential Question," *Education Week* (May 17, 1989), pp. 1, 8-10.

5. "Text of Statement on Education Goals Adopted by Governors," *Education Week* (March 7, 1990), pp. 16-17.

6. Lynn Olson, "'Confusing' Array of Players Charts Course Toward National Standards," *Education Week* (October 23, 1991), pp. 1, 13-15.

7. National Council on Education Standards and Testing, *Raising Standards for American Education* (Washington, D.C.), January 24, 1992.

8. Council for Basic Education, "Standards: A Vision for Learning," *Perspective* 4 (Winter 1991); Debra Viadero, "Curriculum Coalition Urges Broad Focus in Standards Setting," *Education Week* (January 8, 1992), p. 25.

9. Debra Viadero, "Embracing Hirsch's Concepts, Florida School Aims to Instill 'Core Knowledge' in Students," *Education Week* (November 20, 1991), pp. 6-7.

10. Gregory S. Jay, "The First Round of the Culture Wars," *Chronicle of Higher Education* (February 26, 1992), pp. B1-2.

11. Jay, ibid.

American Association of University Women
1111 Sixteenth Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

AAUW promotes equity for women, education, and self-development over the life span, and positive societal change.

The AAUW Educational Foundation provides funds to advance education, research, and self-development for women and to foster equity and positive societal change.

AAUW's Legal Advocacy Fund provides funding and a support system for women seeking judicial redress for sex discrimination.

Sharon Schuster, President, AAUW; Chair of the Board, AAUW Educational Foundation

Alice McKee, President, AAUW Educational Foundation

Sue Butler, President, AAUW Legal Advocacy Fund

Anne L. Bryant, Ed.D., Executive Director

This brief was prepared by Kathy Vandell, Ph.D., Research Associate, Program and Policy Department, and Scott B. Dempsey, Senior Editor, Communications Department.

Copies of all AAUW issue briefs are available from the AAUW Sales Office. You can place a MasterCard or VISA credit card order by calling 800/225-9998, ext. 219.

In principal and in practice, AAUW values and seeks a diverse membership. There shall be no barriers to full participation in this organization on the basis of: race, creed, age, sexual orientation, national origin, or disability.

©1992, American Association of University Women

6/92-10K